

REMARKSClaim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,077,337) in view of Watts et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,897,375). The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the CMP slurry of Lee by using the low electrochemical potential oxidizer, hydrogen peroxide (H_2O_2), of Watts. The Applicant respectfully traverses. One of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated or inclined to add the hydrogen peroxide oxidizer of Watts into the slurry of Lee because Lee specifically teaches a slurry that is based on using a ferrocenium salt as the oxidizer. Additionally, one of ordinary skill in the art would not combine a slurry containing a ferrocenium salt such as the one taught in Lee with a slurry to polish a copper surface, such as the one taught by Watts, because it would cause corrosion of the copper surface. This is because ferrocenium salts contain known pitting corrosion agents of copper, such as sulfates, chlorides, and nitrates. Therefore, combining the slurry taught by Lee with the slurry taught by Watts would create an inoperable combination for the polishing of a copper surface because the ferrocenium salt of the Lee slurry would cause corrosion of the copper surface. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not combine Lee with Watts in order to form a slurry for the purpose of polishing copper and the Applicant's claims 1-11 are not obvious in light of Lee in view of Watts.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: 03/18/ 2003



Heather M. Molleur
Reg. No. 50,432

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300